

**REMARKS**

Claim 5 is objected to because the word "arrange" is to be changed to "arranged". As follows, Claim 5 has been rewritten accordingly to overcome the objection:

5. (currently amended) An apparatus ~~arrange~~ arranged to provide service side filtering of a message in a distributed network, comprising:

a first means for determining if the message is to be sent to a topic subscriber;

a second means coupled to the first means for determining if the message is an extensible markup language (XML) message that conforms to an XML schema specified by a selected XSLT filter;

a third means coupled to the second means for transforming the XML message to form a modified XML message; and

a fourth means coupled to the third means for sending the modified XML message to the topic subscriber.

Claims 1,4,5,8,9 and 12 are rejected under 35 USC 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention. Examiner stated that "'Topic Subscriber' has not been explicitly defined and will therefore be interpreted as a target destination." Applicant respectfully notes that the term "Topic Subscriber" has been explained in the application which states "a publisher will publish an XML message to a Queue or Topic in the MOM system. A subscriber may subscribe to the Queue or Topic and receive the XML message." (page 2, lines 2-4). Therefore, Applicant respectfully submits that Claims 1,4,5,8,9 and 12 are allowable.

Claims 4,8 and 12 are rejected under 35 USC 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards

as the invention. Examiner stated that the wording of Claim 4 is unclear and does not allow accurate reading of the claim. Claims 4,8 and 12 have been rewritten as suggested by examiner in order to allow accurate reading:

4. (currently amended) A method as recited in claim 1, wherein if determining (b) determines that the XML message conforms to a different schema than specified with the XSLT filter, then

sending the original untransformed XML message ~~without any transformation~~ to the topic subscriber.

8. (currently amended) An apparatus as recited in claim 5, wherein if second means determines that the XML message conforms to a different schema than specified with the XSLT filter, then the apparatus further includes,

a fifth means for sending the original untransformed XML message ~~without any transformation~~ to the topic subscriber.

12. (currently amended) Computer program product as recited in claim 9, wherein if determining (b) determines that the XML message conforms to a different schema than specified with the XSLT filter, then the computer program product further includes, computer code for sending the original untransformed XML message ~~without any transformation~~ to the topic subscriber.

Claims 1,3-5,7-9,11 and 12 are rejected under 35 USC 102(a) as being anticipated by IBM Corporation (cross-reference # 0374-4353-42-423-0).

With respect to independent Claims 1,5 and 9, examiner stated in pertinent part that:

"IBM teaches a message transmitted on a network Applying an XSL template to an XML document. Formatting the XML document. And, sending the XML document to its destination."

Applicant respectfully notes that IBM discloses parameterized XSL style sheets for use in a text transformation engine that converts an XML document from one document object model to another by applying XSL style sheets (IBM, page 1, lines 30-40). The aim is to convert the document to a format more closely suited for the recipient and thereby to accommodate for the recipient's limitations and preferences (IBM, page 1, lines 1-8). However, IBM does not filter the contents of the XML document to preserve network bandwidth. In contrast, Applicant's invention as recited in independent Claims 1,5 and 9 describes a method, apparatus and computer program product for providing service side filtering of a message in a distributed network. Unlike IBM, Applicant's invention filters an XML message in order to transmit selected portions of the XML message "over the wire", thereby preserving network bandwidth and improving latency (page 7, lines 5-10). Therefore, Applicant respectfully submits that Claims 1,5 and 9 are allowable over the cited references.

With respect to Claims 3,7 and 11, examiner stated in pertinent part that:

"IBM teaches the method as provided in claim 1, wherein the transforming is based up the specified XSLT filter and an associated XSLT engine. (page 1; IBM teaches a Transformation Engine)"

Dependent Claims 3,7 and 11 depend either directly or indirectly from independent Claims 1,5 and 9 and are also allowable for at least the reasons stated for Claims 1,5 and 9. Therefore, Applicant respectfully submits that Claims 3,7 and 11 are allowable over the cited references.

With respect to Claims 4,8 and 12, examiner stated in pertinent part that:

"IBM teaches that "when patterns are matched" which the XML document then it is transformed. It is inherent that when patterns are not matched, then no transformation takes place and the document continues transmission over the network."

Dependent Claims 4,8 and 12 depend either directly or indirectly from independent Claims 1,5 and 9 and are also allowable for at least the reasons stated for Claims 1,5 and 9. Therefore, Applicant respectfully submits that Claims 4,8 and 12 are allowable over the cited references.

Claims 2,6 and 10 are rejected under 35 USC 103(a) as being unpatentable over IBM Corporation (cross reference # 0374-4353-42-423-0) in view of Laitinen (XML Messaging, Tik 111.590). Examiner stated in pertinent part that:

"IBM teaches the method as recited in claim 1. IBM fails to explicitly teach wherein the determining (a) step is performed by a JMS provider. However, Laitinen teaches that it is well known in the art for a JMS provider to handle messages between applications and components (Laitinen; sections 2.5.3, 2.5.7, 2.5.12, 2.5.13).

Applicant respectfully notes that Laitinen teaches that XML and Java messaging provide flexible and scalable communication in enterprise application integration. Neither Laitinen, nor IBM in light of Laitinen, teach filtering the contents of an XML message prior to sending the message to a recipient in order to preserve network bandwidth. In contrast, Applicant's invention as recited in Claims 2,6 and 10 describes a method, apparatus and computer program product for providing service side filtering of a message in a distributed network, wherein the computer code for determining if the message is to be sent to a subscriber is performed by a JMS provider. Unlike IBM in light of Laitinen, Applicant's invention filters the XML message in order to transmit selected portions of the XML message "over the wire", thereby preserving network bandwidth and improving latency (page 7, lines 5-10). Therefore, Applicant respectfully submits that Claims 2,6 and 10 are allowable over the cited references. Furthermore, dependent Claims 2,6 and 10 depend either directly or indirectly from independent Claims 1,5 and 9 and are also allowable for at least the reasons stated for Claims 20 and 31.

**CONCLUSION**

The Applicant believes that the currently amended independent Claims 1,5 and 9 and dependent Claims 2-4, 6-8 and 10-12 are allowable over the cited references and it is respectfully submitted that all pending claims are allowable. Should the Examiner believe that a further telephone conference would expedite the prosecution of this application, the undersigned can be reached at the telephone number set out below.

Respectfully submitted,  
BEYER WEAVER & THOMAS, LLP



Behfar Bastani-Booshehri  
Reg. No. 52,599

P.O. Box 70250  
Oakland, CA 94612-0250  
(650) 961-8300